



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

so ethical throughout, as Dr. Hunt has elsewhere shown English to be, strictly to adhere to the type in the illustrative references, but his trained judgment has rarely failed him.

The critical review of the representative poets is introduced by a chapter upon the meditative lyrics of the Elizabethan age, in which the courtly lyric took its rise. Dr. Hunt selects from representative poets for treatment in separate chapters, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Byron, Keats, Robt. and Mrs. Browning, Arnold, and Tennyson. His aim, to give only the most representative, explains the omission of many minor poets, who in the lyric attain to a higher reach of excellence than would be possible for them in the epic and dramatic. A compensation for such omission is found in the concluding chapters upon "English Elegies," and "Devotional Poets," and "The Larger Lyric List." These two classes are not commensurate with the meditative lyric; all elegies and hymns are not meditative lyrics; but as the meditative lyric abounds in these classes of poetry, a separate treatment is justified.

The representative lyrical poets given in historical order exhibit an evolution which, though continuous, is best described as "a spiritual ebb and flow." The lyric is as sensitive as mercury to the fluctuations of thought and feeling in life, in which it is intimately involved, and its course is less formal than the evolution of epic and dramatic forms. Dr. Hunt takes, as he says, a long leap from Milton to Wordsworth over a period of unimpassioned didacticism. The Restoration checked the development of Puritan poetry in English literature, but the stream disappeared from England only to emerge in "the fountain Arethuse" in New England. It is here, though late, we are to place the American lyric in its historical connection. The American lyric, as Dr. Hunt's American volume shows, is the lyric of the impassioned, serious, and thoughtful Puritan, quickened in some of its representatives by German transcendental and spiritual philosophy, received directly, or mediately through the later English poets. No just estimate of the Puritan poetry of English literature can be made without including the American lyric; and it is in the meditative variety it finds its highest distinction.

Dr. Hunt's volumes strengthen the impression of the profoundly ethical temper or character of English literature made by his work upon the ethical teachings of English literature.

He spreads before the reader a wealth of the purest and most ennobling poetry in our tongue, unexcelled by that of any other literature except the Hebrew, from which English literature has been enriched. It is evidence of the gravity and sanity of the English mind, in which the morbid, decadent, and unwholesome are not admitted. The meditative lyric, though finding its motive in the great problem of existence, is, as Dr. Hunt shows, as varied in its notes as any other type. The stream is not shrunk by "the dread voice," but runs full to "the higher mood." Character, motive, mental attitude diversify it. We have the reflective lyric of grief, of nature, and even of *vers de société*, running through the length of the gamut from the elegiac and pensive to the playful. Byron and Browning, Milton and Arnold, Poe and Holmes, may all come together in the group.

Dr. Hunt is justified in commending the English meditative lyric to the most delightful and ennobling study, and especially to the clergy. As genial to the subjective temper of our time, it offers an impulse to poetic production, which promises easier success than is possible in other types. These volumes are an admirable introduction to the study. They are full and accurate in their references. The only error discovered is in the title of Bishop given to John Donne.

CHARLES EDWARD HART.

Rutgers College.

FRENCH LITERATURE AND LANGUAGE.

Het Zoeken van "l'âme française" in de Letterkunde en de Taal van Frankrijk. (Redevoering utgesproken bij de Overdracht van het Rectoraat der Rijks-Universiteit te Groningen, den 21sten September 1897.) Door Dr. A. G. VAN HAMEL. Groningen: bij T. B. Wolters, 1897. 8vo, 54 pp.

ON the 21st of September, 1897, Dr. A. G. van Hamel, the well-known Romance scholar, marked the close¹ of his functions as Rector of

¹ According to the traditions of the Dutch universities, the Rector delivers his official speech on the very same day he makes room for his successor.

the University of Groningen by a most eloquent and interesting discourse on Psychological Researches in the Literature and Language of France.

The chief programme of this elaborate speech is announced in the concise preliminary sentence: Apart from its special purpose, every single study of language or literature comprises a psychological result.

This brilliant apology of the highest aims of all our philological studies is praiseworthy in every respect, though of course, now and then, opinions may differ on one point or another.

The study of literature, which undoubtedly furnishes the best psychological results, holds a prominent place in van Hamel's speech; the linguistical researches are kept more in the background.

A summary statement of the chief arguments of this interesting discourse will best enable us to examine his theories.

The significance of the spoken word, says van Hamel, depends even when it is taken as a mere complex of sounds on the meaning it conveys or on the mood it reveals. For good reasons speech has been always considered as the directest and finest revelation of our intellectual life. And though according to Maeterlinck's views, silence is a still better interpreter of the soul (I recall his most appropriate paradox: "*Toutes les paroles se ressemblent, mais tous les silences diffèrent*"), its high value depends certainly on the single circumstance, that the line of distinct sounds is temporarily broken, so that its effect equals that of a pause in music, of a dumb-show in a theatrical performance, filling the gaps in the rhythm of speech.

He who examines the phraseology, the vocabulary, the rhetoric of a writer, endeavors to understand a process of thinking, to appreciate a taste, to watch a fancy in its mysterious moods of creation. He who examines and analyzes another—less personal—element of the style, the coördination and subordination of clauses, learns from the arrangement of the words, from the use of tenses and moods various modifications of thinking and feeling. One need but remember the different meaning which in French the place of the adjective may lend to the relation between substantive and

adjective, or the now-a-days so keenly felt value of the "*imparfait*" which has become a characteristic of the way in which modern novel-writers regard the events they relate in direct opposition to their predecessors.

He who watches the change of meaning of the words of a language discovers the laws which govern this remarkable phenomenon, and sometimes divines from a simple fact a complete change of the manner of thinking, feeling, or even hearing. How often words which were formerly considered elegant and decent, are forever degraded by our euphemistical tendencies; while at the same time a sort of "snobbism," or the desire for characteristic terms, makes us continually borrow words and similes from the lumber-room of the "*argot*" in order to deck our speech with these expressions. Even the phonetician who examines how the sounds and noises which form the elements of the spoken word are produced, does not only study psychological or physical phenomena; he sometimes feels the "*psyche*" in observing the degree of swiftness and regularity with which changes have come about, in witnessing the talent of imitation which secured the success of certain combinations of sounds, or, finally, the effects worked by analogy; namely, the way in which the original vowel or consonant is replaced by the one which is to be met with in a synonym.

That literature and its history belong to the dominion of psychology, does not need any further proof. Literary creations which are written with uprightness, bear witness of noble passions, choice sentiments, artistically refined moods, rhythmically felt sensations, immortal aspirations—fragments of internal life which are sufficiently concreted before reason, fancy and the ear, and therefore, may be revealed as far as it is possible by means of the instrument of language, by word-symbol and sound. Great artists are inclined to think that language is not to be considered as the most perfect instrument of art, and perhaps, it is true that the literary art can but imperfectly reveal our finest sentiments and thoughts, still it cannot be denied that this way of uttering beautiful ideas is within the reach of most people and may meet at least with partial understanding.

The psychological importance of language

and literature renders the value of philological studies independent of the predilection of partial scholars for literary and linguistical researches and preserves them from the temporary flourish which the exploration of limited phenomena may take in narrow circles. Such studies derive their scientific character from the method to which they are subjected. Their importance depends on the scope they aim at. The claims and tasks of philological researches oblige us now and then to turn our attention to trifles, in order to examine the soundness of our methods or the handling of our critical apparatus; but he who does not forget the chief interest over the bagatelles which form the subject of his daily work, does not run the risk of losing himself in dry pedantism.

He who fixes his attention on a foreign living language and on the prose and poetry which are written in it, is especially struck with the psychological character of literary and linguistical studies. Now and then in reading, hearing, seeking, thinking, he feels the contact with the strange soul. And when this language, moreover, is daily spoken around him, so that he does not merely *see* it before him in an unwonted form of writing and a peculiar construction, but *hears* its identical sounds, its peculiar accentuation, with a "timbre" and articulation which he must forever fail to attain; when moreover its literature, far from presenting a well-rounded totality, continually urges upon his knowledge new works, which with perplexing rapidity pile themselves up on his writing-table;—but then, even then he receives an overwhelming impression of the life which is quivering in all these letters, thrills within these sounds, stirs in all these words, a life, to understand whose mysteries he daily aspires—and fails.

Sometimes peculiar, personal elements which appear momentarily in the words and works, claim our special interest. It would betray a lack of penetration and seriousness if he who wants to seize the national generalities, could not condescend to the study of individualities, of trifles, even most insignificant things. But generality maintains its rights. The poet's word: "*Malgré nous l'infini nous tourmente*" must also be applied to scientific studies. He who devotes his full attention to special phe-

nomena views them as but he himself can view them; namely, surrounded by a peculiar atmosphere. And when the condition of these surroundings imposes itself heavily on his consciousness, how can he then manage to escape from the tormenting problems which are stirred, not by the object in view, but by the atmosphere itself, which necessarily incites his curiosity and his desire for a clearer insight? Thus it becomes nearly inevitable to search for the national nucleus which is hidden in a foreign living language and its literature, the more so, as now and then we receive distinct impressions of the peculiar type of foreign nations even outside of the narrow circle of scientific researches.

When Goethe proclaimed Diderot as the writer who the most of all French writers approached German ideas—this judgment did certainly not depend on the supposition that the favorite dishes of the leader of the encyclopedists may be prepared in the best manner in the kitchen of a German "*Kneipe*." When French critics designate Macbeth as: "*la plus française des pièces de Shakespeare*," when Paris society calls one of their present novel-writers with a charming nick-name Anatole Suisse, in order to distinguish him from Anatole France with whom he bears a certain resemblance; when several broad-sounding exclamations of wonder call forth the impression of Germanic slowness, or the frequent use of superlatives and diminutives invokes the graceful image of Italian vivacity or Italian fondling: all these impressions we receive correspond but with a safe reality and allow the forming of a strict judgment according to a measure which is, perhaps, rather to be felt than to be precisely defined. To him who thinks that such ideas depend on a mere prejudice, I oppose a statement of my colleague Sijmons: The scientific treatment of a question is not separated by a wide gulf from mere dilettanteism Everywhere we find a gradual climbing up from aimless perception to conscious seeking, from dilettanteism to science.—The inquiry for a national essence, for a collective—psychic element in the language and literature of France is consequently included in the frame of scientific studies. The rather curious expression: *Het Zoeken van "l'âme française"*

was chosen by me on purpose, in order to suggest the great problem in question. The term *l'âme française* is actual. This somewhat sentimental expression, which is perhaps due to German or Russian influence, is often heard now instead of the frequently used: *le génie national, le caractère français ou l'esprit gaulois*. Often it is used when the national character in its various revelations and national tendencies which emerge in language and literature cannot be indicated point-blank. Repeatedly the term *l'âme française* occurs in the debate which is carried on between nationalism and cosmopolitanism. Many people who wish to preserve *l'âme française* from foreign contamination, claim that Ibsen is to be forcibly excluded from the French stage. Others try to justify their sympathy for this poet of the North by maintaining that "*l'âme norvégienne*" must be of French origin having been imported into Norway by the editor of George Sand. The dissension on the qualities of *l'âme française* and its literary monopoly has been the cause of numerous debates—even of unbloody and rather awkward duels. Even in the interesting controversy between the new-classic verse of the Parnassians and the so-called "*vers libre*" of the young ones, which by their antagonists is called: "*le vers amorphe*" or "*le vers invertébré*"—the term "*l'âme française*" is now and then to be heard. And academical critics, such as Lemaître and Brunetière, historiographers such as Texte and Rosset, scholars such as Gaston Paris, speak of "*l'âme française*" as soon as they investigate the inspiration of the literary phenomena which form the subject of their diligent philological and historical researches.

Closely connected with our national-psychological problem is another phenomenon which furnishes one proof more of its importance. I mean the awaking of the idea of unity, of the spiritual oneness (to use a theological term) which exists between the French literature of the Middle Ages and that of modern times. The ignorance and indifference of the French in regard to their oldest literature and language—an ignorance which already dates from the sixteenth century and which through Boileau and his school had become the mark of literary superiority, began to vanish towards

the middle of our century. But the indisputable fact that the knowledge of mediæval literature could only be revived by scientific studies, served but to widen the gulf which already existed between ancient and classic periods. The glowing zeal with which the professors and students of German High Schools devoted themselves exclusively to the study of Old French (both language and literature), mostly without any connection with the forms of the living language and with the products of modern literature, but contributed to aggravate the separation between ancient and modern times.

But during the last decennium the constellation of French philology has visibly changed. In Germany as well as in France a more important place has been yielded to the living language and modern literature than ever before.

Living and dead joined together as the expression of one intellectual literary and artistic life of a nation, forming the object of one and the same method, render more obvious the uniform national character of French language and literature, and cause the various shades of the details to fade before the general tint of the totality; and at the same time the strong desire of searching for the individual life of a nation in the history of its language and in its various literary products becomes a necessity.

The earnest endeavors of the French nation towards "concentration" of their national life facilitates the search after a collective-intellectual element. The cause of these endeavors is chiefly to be sought in the political history of France, and the supremacy of Paris over the provinces may be considered as one of the chief factors and the symbol of this tendency. "*Le peuple français si homogène, si ramassé dans son unité*" runs one of Alfred de Vigny's letters, and has not the same thing been said over and over again?—It is true that the French nation is born from a combination of many races, but a keen sense of national unity was developed in the course of centuries. It cannot be denied that French literature in nearly all its periods has been chiefly of foreign origin. I but mention a generally known fact when I point to the strong influence of Italy in the sixteenth century, an influence which continually

leads to further discoveries, or the impulse which the French stage received in the seventeenth century from Spain and Italy, the influence of England in the eighteenth, of Germany in the beginning of this century. The chauvinists who would anxiously bar the way to Norway and Russia, are not at all versed in the literary traditions of their nation. In the intellectual barter of nations France always understood how to give, to claim and to appropriate. The foreign borrowed goods, however, were with extraordinary dexterity transformed into national property and this talent of refining and harmonizing is so great that the peculiarity of the French genius, the personality of French art has been said to consist in it. If France in the age of Louis XIV had done homage to protectionism, the literature of this epoch would have missed its greatest splendor.

One of these adaptations of the national genius to foreign literature has been so intense, so complete and so persisting, that it becomes impossible to distinguish the native from the foreign elements. The Renaissance has put a Classical stamp on French literature which leads us to misconceptions. Often we feel tempted to proclaim those poets as genuine national interpreters who imbibed the Hellenic esthetics or whose artistic forms reproduce those of the poets of ancient Rome. It would lead us too far if we tried to find the causes of this phenomenon. The infiltration of the Greek-Latin element has been so strong that one may speak of a complete metamorphosis, of a kind of regeneration of "l'âme française," the antique fold of which represents one of its most striking qualities. French "Romanticism"—to risk a paradox—may be considered as an effort to restore pure Classicism. Perhaps the numerous recent tendencies which at present appear in French literature, will once more replace its foundation and achieve the complete emancipation of the French genius from the supremacy of the Classics. In the meanwhile it seems but natural that many who at present fervently cling to what they call the "national" element of their literature, strive in good faith for what they themselves call *la tradition gréco-latine ou l'esprit classique*.

The specific national character of French

literature may, therefore, chiefly be sought: first, in a wonderful capacity for adaptation, a curious gift of artistically combining various elements; secondly, in the language itself in which this literature is written. But the solution of this question is not so easily attained. The instrument of the language, for instance, cannot be entirely trusted for individual inquiries. The young Belgian poets who write in the same language as their Paris "confrères" are often expressively called the representatives of "l'âme flamande." By and bye, perhaps, the cosmopolitan tendencies of our age will create "une âme européenne," which though speaking various tongues, will yet be the same in all other respects. But we in the meanwhile may still look for nationality in the world of literary ideas and styles, and above all in its views and moods.

For our purposes we must first of all pay attention to the *critical moments* in the history of French literature, moments during which it comes into contact with foreign literary elements. From the sympathy with which the foreign infusion is received, from the reserve with which this sympathy is tempered, from the modifications which half unconsciously are applied to the appropriated ideas, one may guess the divergence and similitude of mood, taste and temper, that for the moment at least exist between the two nations. The history of French literature rather abounds in such critical moments. They already emerge in the Middle Ages, when a Frenchman of the twelfth century adapts the masterpiece of Virgil to the taste of his countrymen, when the mystic German knight Wolfram von Eschenbach borrows the *Legend of the Holy Grail* from Chrétien de Troyes, or when a Dutchman of the thirteenth century in every respect "verdietscht" the *Parthenopeus de Blois*. Ample materials for both psychological and philological studies are furnished by these heterogenous productions. When Gaston Paris tried to make out the Celtic nucleus of the legend of Tristan and pursued its transformation through French taste and French customs, he but treated with the accuracy of the scholar and with the keen interest of an eminent thinker, a fragment of historical psychology—and strangely must have rung on

his ear the remark of his confrère Joseph Bertrand, who in the French academy, directly after having cited his work, risked the unjustifiable criticism "Renan appelait votre méthode scientifique, elle n'est que savante."

These critical moments occur still more frequently in the modern periods of French literature. We need but remember Corneille's genuine French *Cid*, which is born from a broadly expounded Spanish drama, or the national metamorphosis which the Spanish and Italian *Don Juan* underwent in the skilful hands of Molière—or the typical French Voltaire, who in England discovers Shakespeare, becomes his fervent admirer, tries to copy him while at the same time he abuses him as "sauvage ivre" and as "vilain singe"—or the visit of Mme de Staël to Weimar, where she received such an imperfect impression of German poetry: in short, numerous literary contacts and conflicts which deserve a most accurate observation and description, because they reveal national antipathies as well as affinities.—The period in which we live furnishes ample material for psychological researches and may be called already an extraordinarily "critical" era. I pass to another method, the explanation of which offers me an opportunity of describing at length a few literary phenomena of ancient times. According to Brunetière, French literature bears a prominently social character which reveals itself in the tendency to please a greater number of countrymen, to give expression to the ideas of the multitude and to exercise a certain influence upon the forms of social life. French literature may be called social in opposition to the English which may be described as individual, to the Italian which appears artistical, to the German which is rather philosophical, to the Spanish which is "chevaleresque."—But this characteristic rather indicates the direction in which we must seek for the occult psychological elements than the essential faculties themselves. It denotes much more a formal than a material quality, and contains rather the formula of a temperament than the aspect of a distinct mental life. At any rate Brunetière's formula gains strength by the assertion which I will illustrate by a few examples.

In a "genre" which in the beginning of the

literary development arose on national ground, which was immediately adopted by a multitude of poets and was received with approbation in wider circles, which moreover preserved its distinctive mark in the course of centuries in spite of the change of taste and social institutions—in such a fragment of French literature we are fully entitled to seek for "l'âme française." In this regard, perhaps, the national heroic poems of the Middle Ages, the powerful literature of the "chansons de geste" surpass everything else. The standpoint of historical research has attained here a degree which is suitable for drawing general conclusions. In the Germanic cult of heroes—while history and legend were blending—introduced by the Franks on the conquered ground of romanized Gaul—must be sought the origin of the heroic-poetical disposition which called forth the French national epics. But the conditions which favored this new creation, did not exist before the Romance elements, helped by the definitive victory of the Gallic-Romance forms of language and by the propagation of orthodox Christianity, had completely pervaded the germanic element and given birth to a new nationality.

From the baptism of "Chlodovech" Gaston Paris dates the "epic ferment," by which term he so appropriately designs the fertile disposition which called forth the national heroic poems, representing the first powerful expression of an exalted collective sentiment, a national ideal, of an "âme française."

This ferment lasted for centuries, foaming up with fresh vigor, as often as the fame of a heroic deed spread in wider circles, as often as one of the Merovingian princes seemed to approach the standard of the princes of Franconia, who exclusively devoted their services to God and their native country.—About the essential qualities of the old Merovingian epics we are still in the dark. The golden age of the "chansons de geste" dawns towards the end of the eleventh century. In the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries, France appears covered all over with a continually growing vegetation of heroic poems, which sometimes spread too exuberantly, sometimes even throw out new sprouts. One may hardly conceive a satisfactory idea of the inner and

outward life of this literature, of the poets by whom it was created, or of the audience for whose benefit it was destined. But this literature, which in the form in which it was preserved, embraces more than two centuries, and the origin of which must be sought still some centuries earlier, coincides with the birth of French nationality, making its appearance in a pure Romance form, reveals in its contents the intrinsical blending of Germanic heroism and Christian idealism which changed the romanized Celts into French. The character and importance of this ancient heroic poetry are sufficiently determined by diligent researches. Surprising discoveries on this matter are no more to be expected. We are, therefore, fully entitled to hail with the national epics of the Middle Ages the first conscious appearance, the first vigorous manifestation of "l'âme française" and to describe the aspect we may here obtain of it, in the following manner: an exalted patriotic sentiment, supported by an idealism which exceeds the bounds of common national ambition. So much about France of ancient times. But is this same element of "l'âme française" to be found in the literary tendencies of later periods? Here we have to surmount two different obstacles. First, France has not produced any high-spirited heroic poetry since the Middle Ages. Secondly, patriotism, at least in the classic periods, never was an essential ferment in French literature. The first objection need hardly be noticed. Epic poetry depends on peculiar circumstances; it represents the poetical form of a very limited space of time; and Voltaire really took too much pains with his "Henriade," in order to contradict the "boutade" of the marquis of Malèzieux: *Le Français n'a pas la tête épique*. The second objection is of more consequence. France never was entirely destitute of patriotic poetry. One of the professors of the Sorbonne even published a considerable number of "conférences" on the "Poésie patriotique" of modern times, among which the poetry that dates from the wars of the first republic holds a prominent place. The popular names of Béranger and Auguste Barbier are quite characteristic of a later period, as that of the poet of the *Châtiments* and of *Année terrible* of modern times.

From the campaigns of the Valois and the civil wars of the sixteenth century, literary monuments have been preserved, but this literature recalls no remembrance of the heroic poetry of the Middle Ages. But with the historiographers about the middle and towards the end of the sixteenth century, for instance, in the memoirs of Monluc or with Agrippa l'Aubigné, now and then some reminiscences of the "chansons de geste" are to be found. In the seventeenth century, French patriotism was absorbed in adulation of the sovereigns, and in the first half of the eighteenth century it became so faint that according to Höffding, Rousseau's vocation was to revive this feeling; without the *Contrat social* and *Emile*, the *Marseillaise* would have been impossible. But the difficulty is not yet entirely removed: France does not possess a brilliant national-historical drama. Voltaire's, Du Bellay's and Chénier's attempts failed, and Brunetière in speaking of *Lairé* and *Adelaïde du Guesclins*, mentions how interesting it would be to find out for what reasons *Andromaque* and *Le Cid* have remained the national tragedies of France. It is strange, indeed, that such a literary *genre* as the drama, which especially is fit to develop collective ideas and sentiments, and which perhaps in no other country has become and remained as popular as in France, completely ignores the brilliant events that were crowded together in the history of the King's wars. Even the author of the ancient mystery-plays took their subjects very rarely from profane national history, when Scripture topics were forbidden. The question is too complicated to be discussed here. Undoubtedly the drama—apart from the circumstance that it must be considered as the most conservative of all literary *genres*, and therefore does not allow important changes to take place abruptly—permits chiefly a sympathetic participation of the suspense which is born from mental conflicts, so that the outward costume, in which this conflict appears, is but a matter of small consequence, while the principal attention is fixed on the main interest, as long as neither national nor special sympathies disturb the dramatic effect. At any rate, the element of "l'âme française" which so vigorously appears in the "chansons de geste"—an ex-

alted patriotic feeling, national heroism, supported by an idealism which strives for the highest goods of humanity, never ceased, even in the days of deep humiliation, to bear witness in the mind of the French nation. Is this national pride not nearly swollen to a bursting point, when the rights of humanity are proclaimed in the name of the French nation, when the empire of liberty and justice is declared to be identical with the one and indivisible French republic? May the soldiers of 1794, who with Stendhal abused all their enemies as "des imbéciles ou de pitoyables fripons," not be called genuine descendants of Roland and Guillaume? In our days the ferment of the ancient epics is again busy to pervade literature. One need but remember the forever renewing popularity of "Iehanne la bonne Lorraine, Qu'Englois brûlèrent à Rouen" or the recent revival of "l'épouyé napoléonienne," which conquered a convenient corner in all modern literary *genres*. But our time does not yet belong to the domain of scientific studies; I but mentioned it to gain some further proof for my assertion that a national-heroic and at the same time human idealism is not only an ancient but a stable element of "l'âme française."

By means of another quite different example I will attempt to prove that the study of a literary phenomenon of the Middle Ages may serve as a "point de départ" for the treatment of our psychological problem. For a long time there was a firm belief in the existence of love-courts in France, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In 1825, Diez contested for the first time this hypothesis, which was chiefly due to Raynouard. His arguments, which later on were taken up again by Gaston Paris and Pio Rajna, remained unassailable until the Danish scholar, E. Trojel, subjected the whole question to a new treatment. But neither Trojel's dissertation, nor his critical edition of the book of Andreus Capellanus, suffices to overthrow Diez' conclusions. The young Dane was obliged to admit that among the twenty-one "judicia amoris" quoted by Andreas, but four in case of need, may be considered as real sentences. The first case concerns a lady whose knight, engaged in a Crusade, sends her no message from the Holy

Land. The lady wants to accept another lover though the confidant of the absent knight, his "secretarius," disapproves of the untimely substitute. The Countess of Champaign, before whose tribunal the cause is pleaded, finds fault with the lady. The knight, says she, left his lady-love for the sake of a good cause, and his sending no message must be called laudable discretion. The second case concerns the "secretarius" of an enamored knight, who by abusing his privileges, insinuated himself into the graces of the fair lady. The Countess of Champaign, this time backed up by sixty ladies of her court, pronounces a terrible sentence on both the seducer and seduced: they shall forever be excluded from the land of true love. The third case has to do with a knight who betrayed the love-secret of his friend. The culpable tale-teller is condemned by a court of ladies from Gascony to live in future a loveless life. The fourth case refers to a lady who disdains the love of a knight without refusing his presents. A sentence delivered by the Queen of France herself compels the wicked flirt to refuse all presents or to accept the lover.

The controversy about the "cours d'amour" remains vital on account of the connection into which it is brought by Rajna and Trojel, and most explicitly by Gaston Paris, with "l'amour courtois," which about the same time made its appearance in France and in French literature. This appellation indicates a peculiar conception and a peculiar practice of love which attributes to this simple and natural feeling the character of a refined culture, stamps it as an art, a science, a social virtue, selects it for the finest and noblest theme of artistic poetry and literary fiction, claims scholasticism for its analysis, and devises a kind of metaphysics for its glorification. Gaston Paris, who characterizes this love by contrasting it with the fatal passion of Tristan and Isold, and the innocent playfulness of lovers in the *Lais* of Marie de France, as un "amour exalté et presque mystique sans cesser pourtant d'être sensuel," designates the *Conte de la Charette* by Chrétien de Troyes as the standard work in which this kind of love is described and praised.

The guilty passion of Lancelot and Queen Guenièvre—the chief persons of this novel—

became indeed the unique model of true love, of which Francesca—one of the numerous victims of the Lancelot—will bear witness later on: "Amor che al cor gentil rattos'apprende." This love springs from unknown sources; through the eyes it enters the heart and wounds it suddenly. It is at once full of mystery and refinement, ennobling and civilizing in its effects, and its claims are so imperious, that even the knight's honor must yield to it. This love is lawless and cannot be otherwise: for in wedlock true love cannot exist. The Countess of Champagne, on being solemnly consulted by letter *an inter conjugatos verus amor locum sibi valeat invenire*, answered by a missive, dated on the first of May, 1174, that true love must be exempt from right and duty, terms which serve to regulate the relations between husband and wife: *Dicimus enim et stabilito tenore firmamus amorem non posse suas inter duos jugales extendere vires.*

At the court of this same Marie de Champagne Chrétien de Troyes composed his novel. Probably he wrote under the influence of the minstrels of the South. For "l'amour courtois" springs from the southern parts of France: Bernard de Ventadorn and somewhat later "Peire Rogier" sang, lived, and loved at the courts of the very same ladies whose "judicia amoris" had gained such a far-spread reputation. But Chrétien de Troyes, the subtle anatomist and painter of sentiments, is the principal northern representative of this love. The charm of his poetry and his growing fame enlarged the dominion of this love both in literature and in manners. With him the subtle curiosity of this love—the detailed description of which appears now and then rather childish; for instance, when the poet takes great pains to illustrate by fitting examples that love can make two hearts into one, while each of them remains dwelling in its own body—has become popular. Pre-existing forms of literature such as *Tristan*, nearly all the lyrics of the thirteenth century, even the heroic poetry of more ancient date, were pervaded by the influence of this peculiar conception of love. In the South it assumed forms which became more and more abstract and crystalized—and when Dante wrote his *Vita nuova*, he but revived the old French love-song, the song of "l'amour courtois."

In many respects "l'amour courtois" is closely connected with the peculiar manners and ideas of the Middle Ages and presents, therefore, a transitory character. But one of its features goes deeper and reveals a state of mind, which allows us to find analogies in the further course of French literature. We have to do with a refinement of love which proceeds from an intrinsic blending of the sensual desire with subtle reflection and analysis, a tendency to enjoy this sentiment not as a mere sentiment, but to taste and to comprehend every single element of which it is composed, so that love finally ceases to be a mere feeling and supplies at the same time an intellectual want. I might trace, here, how this cerebral element of French love—which in the first part of the *Roman de la Rose* is still gayly tempered with Ovid's cheerfulness, while the second part of it is fast degenerating with Jean de Meung into dry pedantism and encyclopedical science, called forth the love-allegories which were so pernicious to the literature of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. But I prefer showing how this element—even after the complete regeneracy of French literature by the Renaissance—persisted and created, perhaps, under the influence of the predominant philosophy—social phenomena which remind us of "l'amour courtois," curious reflections on love which recall the novels of Chrétien de Troyes. The movement of the "Précieuses" with their burlesque misconception of love, with which the rather tame suitors of the "Hôtel Rambouillet" complied with admirable patience and of which both the genuine and the counterfeit beaux-esprits tried to profit, does it not present a curious counterpart of the circles of the ancient "jugements d'amour" in Champagne and Gascony? Does the classic French drama not bear the same stamp? Tightly coerced by the fetters of the Aristotelian rules, it is directly driven by this one-sided check of its development into the direction of analytical psychology, of the erotic casuistry which, insipid and tasteless when handled by subordinate intelligences, helps to create immortal masterpieces, as soon as a genius of the rank of Corneille dramatizes the sublime love—debate of Chimène and Rodrigue, or a psychologist of unrivalled acuteness as Racine chooses for the exquisite theme of his tragedies (which

in spite of their bland harmonious form are so adroitly devised) the mental struggles of Hector's widow, the pricks of conscience which torment Phèdre or Bérénice's unfortunate love for Titus.

I pass rapidly over modern times. A trace of the old "judicia amoris" may perhaps be discovered in the so-called "pièces à thèse" of Alexandre Dumas, in the dramatized "plaidoyers" of the *Dame aux Camélias*, of the *Femme de Claude* or *Denise*, or even in the plays of the young writers, who as soon as they write "pièces à idées" deposit not only a fine sentiment but a fragment of subtle erotic philosophy in their dramas.

Are not the psychological novels of Paul Bourget and his school (the finely-spun analyses of *Mensonges* and *Cœur de femme*) in many respects but modern counterparts of "tirades" we encounter in the romantic tales of Chrétien de Troyes? And the subtle questions, which in Paris as so-called "jeu des petits papiers" are asked about love, and the solutions of which are now and then collected by a high-spirited countess in a "Livre d'or," what are they in reality but a revival of the questions which in the twelfth century were settled with decent grace by a "réunion de dames de Gascogne," or by the Countess of Champaign and her sixty ladies? When now-a-days love-affairs in Paris are approved or disapproved by quite serious people according to a standard which puzzles the judgment of the foreigner, the latter invariably receives the impression that even in modern France "regulae amoris" prevail, which unintelligible to strangers, recall the days of Andreas Capellanus!—At any rate—and farther does my conclusion not tend—the erotic-cerebral element which so frequently appears in literature, may be considered as one of the main features of "l'âme française." It is a fact that the soul of a nation reveals itself the most frankly in its language; nevertheless we can hardly discern with which psychological features the linguistic peculiarities correspond. The very best thing one might do would be to advise every one who searches for "l'âme française" in the language of the French nation to try to learn the language as carefully and thoroughly as possible, to try to write it as it *must* be written, to speak it as it

must be spoken; for a reproduction which is in accordance with the rules of art, carries with it a keen sense of the identical language and enables us to perceive more accurately the contact with the foreign soul, allowing a more intimate acquaintance with the occult "psyche."

One may examine, however, whether among the various elements of the language none may be found, the study of which would be of the greatest consequence for the pursuit of the so often mentioned psychological aim.

The study of semasiology promises more than it fulfils. The national significance of metaphors, for instance, depends much more on the degree of civilization to which they refer, on the institutions and customs from which they are borrowed, than on a disclosure of peculiar feelings or of a collective temperament. In the "musée des métaphores" which might be got up by every nation the historical pictures are more numerous represented than the symbolical figures.

The formation of words and the chapter on syntax help many to make an interesting discovery, but the most important element seems to be the one which belongs to the phonetic department, and consequently to the least conscious faculty of expression, I mean the system of accentuation, understanding by it the more or less heightened intensity with which we pronounce one of the syllables of a word by means of a stronger expiration and a sharper articulation. That this accent reaches so far back into the history of the language, that it remained stable in the course of centuries, that with very rare exceptions it is to be found in all French dialects, that it strikes immediately the ear of the foreigner without revealing its mysteriousness, that the phoneticians of our day still disagree about the character of the French accent,—all these circumstances combine to lend a higher value to its study, even with regard to the psychological examination of the French language.

We all know that during the transformation of Latin into Romance, while new languages sprang from the mixture of the forms and words of Rome's *lingua plebeja* with the language of the barbarians of the various provinces, the Latin word-accent has been the sport of this transformation.

But in none of the Romance languages was the power of the accent so prevalent as in the Gallic-Romance, especially in the language of the northern parts of France, where it operates not only as a forcibly striking but as an incisive instrument.

In the sixteenth century the volubility and fluency of this accent has already become so obvious that in grammarians of this and later periods the absurdest ideas on the place and character of the French accent are to be met with; perhaps only those who understood English and taught their native tongue to English people, had attained a better insight by means of the contrast offered by the two languages. By and bye the weakening of unaccented syllables and the disappearance of several consonants helped to increase the fluency of the French accent. As if this riddle needed a better solution, both linguists and phoneticians, Frenchmen and foreigners, zealously seek for the accent of the French language with the help of the ear and various instruments. "Où est l'accent?" has become one of the phonetic puzzles of the present day. Phoneticians such as Ellis and Sweet, linguists such as Schuchardt, maintain that the accent has been transferred from the last syllable to the first, or at least to the root of the word. Others, such as Paul Passy and Louis Havet, believe in a gradual shifting of the accent which has not yet come to a close, wherefore in all probability but one of the following generations would pronounce "le Palais Royal" and "le Théâtre français."

The researches are much hindered by the fact that French people do not trust the ear of the foreigners, while the latter maintain that the French are the worst judges of their own diction. It cannot be denied that in 1811 the Italian Scoppa was the first who initiated the French into the real character of their versification. But is the foreign ear to be relied upon?

We feel rather sceptically disposed when we hear that the great linguist Meyer-Lübke maintains that even in Paris an "oxytone" pronunciation is considered as rather old-fashioned, while the learned phonetician Storm declares a distinct "oxytone" pronunciation is at present the rule in the northern parts of France. As to the trustworthiness of the French ear I but recall the anecdote of

the German, who consulted a Frenchman about the right way to pronounce: *considération*, *considération*, *considération*, *considération*, or *considération*—and who received the prompt answer, that the hearer could find no difference at all between these five pronunciations.

I agree with the scholars who believe the word-accent of the French language still to hover on the last full-sounded syllable of the words. A vigorous argument in favor of this doctrine is furnished by the peculiar French pronunciation of Latin which was already noted by Erasmus. Jean Passy reminds us that French babies as soon as they utter but one syllable of a long word in order to denote an object, invariably choose the last one: *ton* for *bouton*, *zin* for *magasin*, from which fact we may deduce that this syllable must have struck their ear most distinctly. The fate of foreign proper-names on French lips is notorious. *Ibsen* becomes *Ibsèn*, *Spinoza* *Spinosa*, etc.

I shall certainly not deny that the French accent may by and bye be exposed to modifications which individually exist already with orators and actors as well as in certain dialects. But the assertion that the system of Germanic accentuation will by and bye displace the old French accent seems rather inadmissible, and if France ever should pronounce *l'Alsace et la Lorraine*, I believe that the French soul, which is still mourning for the lost provinces, must itself be annexed beforehand.

The question about the accent is closely connected with the peculiar character of French versification. The origin of the French verse coincides without doubt with the same extensive mutilation of Gallic-Romance words which exercised a direct influence on the accentuation of the French language.

Even the debate about "le vers libre" proves, that with some right the accentuation must be noticed as soon as "l'âme française" and its manifestations are to be watched in the language itself.

Am I to look now for a formula or to invent an epithet in order to point out the peculiar aspect of its life which reveals itself here most clearly? I admit—and nobody will be astonished at my confession, because we have

here no more to do with literary phenomena or distinct thoughts and feelings—that I can offer you neither a formula nor an epithet. Perhaps the general character of French diction will induce us to praise this nation for its quickness of thought, its refined taste and its prompt expressiveness.

I remember that I once found beneath the illustration of an advertisement some words which referred to the inimitable grace of Paris ladies: Prenez un peu ça, Mesdames les étrangères! With this mysterious expressive little word "ça" I must content myself provisionally as to the psychological nucleus of French accentuation. But I believe too firmly in the power and unlimited zeal of scientific researches not to agree with the answer I received once from a German colleague on this same subject: Das "ça" soll auch noch herauskommen!"

M. J. MINCKWITZ.

Karlsruhe.

GERMAN FOLK-POETRY.

Poetische Beziehungen des Menschen zur Pflanzen- und Tierwelt im heutigen Volkslied auf hochdeutschem Boden. Von M.E. MARRIAGE. Heidelberg dissertation, 1898. Reprinted from *Alemannia*, xxvi (Bonn, 1898), pp. 97–183.

A DISSERTATION, written more often for the doctor's title than for the advancement of knowledge, is not always fit material for strict revision. In the present instance, however, the authoress has chosen a topic which is of vital importance in the consideration of the *Volkslied*, and therefore, of the modern German lyric; namely, the treatment of Nature (vegetable and animal life) in its relationship to Man (human life). That she has treated the subject incoherently is to be regretted, for only a logical and full classification can help matters, and, if nothing essentially new and convincing can be offered, the investigation had better be left where Ludwig Uhland was content to leave it.

Characteristic of Dr. Marriage's treatment of the whole question is the second paragraph of her introductory remarks (p. 97),¹ where she naïvely deals with the different attitude

¹ I quote from *Alemannia*, xxvi, Heft 2.

towards nature in the *Volkslied* and the *Kunstlied*.

"For the cultured man, the dweller in the city," she says, "nature is rather a dilettantism; for the peasant it is a business. Sundays and holidays we pay her a formal visit; he is in the fields week in, week out, with the cattle, and his songs show unmistakable traces of this." [Query: Of his being with the cattle?] "Therefore nature-pictures obtrude themselves upon the poetizing part of the people for the adornment as well as the elucidation of the song." Why "therefore"? Does the peasant in his barnyard represent the *Volksdichter*, and the townsman in his shop or his study, the *Kunst-dichter*?

Paragraph three defines the sense in which the authoress uses the term "modern *Volkslied*."

"By modern *Volkslied*," she says, "I understand such songs as are gladly sung by the people to-day, no matter whether they be of ancient or of recent origin."

Yet, after this sweeping statement of her position, she excludes from examination

"all songs which can be referred to a near source in the *Kunstlyrik*; besides, very generally, Low-German songs, church folk-songs, children's songs, *Lügenlieder*, *Sprüche* and *Schnaderhüpfel*."

How carefully Dr. Marriage excludes *Schnaderhüpfel* may be gathered when actual count of her citations reveals the fact that she calls two collections of them to witness forty-two times (Ludw. v. Hörmann's *Schnaderhüpfel aus den Alpen*, twenty-one times; H. Dunger's *Rundts und Reimsprüche aus dem Vogtlande*, twenty-one times).

Suppose, however, that the authoress be taken at her word, and it be granted that she abides strictly by the definition of the term *Volkslied* which she sets up: of what value can a study of the *Volkslied*'s attitude towards nature be, which leaves out of consideration the older *Volkslieder* as such, and deals only with the popular songs of the day, which may again be old *Volkslieder* or modern street-ballads (*Gassenhauer*)?

Confusion becomes chaos, when the treatment is closely examined: the divisions of the study will serve to make this apparent.² They begin as follows:

I. Plant and Man. A. Parallels. 1. Beauty. 2. Ugliness.—The Life of Plants: 3. Bloom.